

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 120 332

UD 015 918

AUTHOR Willhelm, Sidney M.
TITLE The Race and Racism of the I.Q. Argument.
PUB DATE Aug 75
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the American Sociological Association annual meeting (San Francisco, California, August 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$1.67 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Differences; Economic Factors; Genetics; Intelligence Differences; Intelligence Factors; *Intelligence Quotient; *Nature Nurture Controversy; *Negro Achievement; Negroes; Racial Differences; *Racial Discrimination; Racial Factors; *Racism

ABSTRACT

A brief historical resume outlining the relationship between economics, racism, and intellectual justification for racism begins this paper, which notes that the I.Q. argument is a racist ideology in exactly the same way that Christianity, Darwinism, and Equality have been systems of justifications for America's racism. It fits the definition of racism - the formulation of criteria with an impact upon color so that the detrimental outcome is assured in spite of what the person who is being judged might do. A black cannot win under the I.Q. argument for he is not endowed with that innate genetic ability called "intelligence". The genetic interpretation is racist in other ways, in that the subject matter selected for investigation is racist. Furthermore, a racist under pinning of the approach is found not only in the view but also within the responses to what is being purported as scientific research. The I.Q. argument is also racist because the black is held accountable for failure. I.Q. theories and their instant popularity arrive at a strategic moment in time when fantastically new technology makes labor and mind so dispensable that reliance upon people is no longer essential. The advocates of I.Q. inferiority offer a perfect rationale for whites to dismiss the technologically disposable blacks who are deemed lacking in sufficient intelligence. The technological transformation and its significance for black people become a matter of survival when the connection between biology and intelligence as they relate to genocide is considered. (Author/AM)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED120332

The Race and Racism of the I. Q. Argument

A mere handful of social analysts persists in the view that Blacks stand little chance for meaningful survival in American society. This pessimistic outlook has been careful to point out that America pursues an inevitable conditional genocidal course, not as an aberration from a set of basically sound and humane principles but precisely because, basically, white Americans upheld an unyielding distain for nonwhite peoples.¹ "In their optimism and eagerness to prove that assimilation could proceed rapidly--given laws against discrimination and vigorous enforcement of these laws--," writes Lewis Killian, "sociologists have failed to take due and realistic account of the depth of white prejudice and the shortsightedness of white self-interest..."² Regardless of perspective, virtually all schools of thought among traditional, orthodox sociologists--even those obviously imbued with a sincere concern for the fate of Black people--have been racist.³ In this paper, I would like to probe the racism of the I. Q. perspective inasmuch as the proponents revive what we all thought was a dead issue--namely, the biological inferiority of Black people vis-a-vis white intelligence.

In order to comprehend the relevancy of the I. Q. argument, it will be necessary to present a brief historical resume outlining the relationship between economics, racism, and intellectual justifications for racism.

Economic ambition by white settlers accounts for seizing upon race; in the agricultural economy of a fledgling nation undergoing the initial stage of colonial development, physical labor was at a premium; profits could be quickly made through slavery. White exploitation of black labor was initially justified upon the basis of Christianity: blacks were merely beasts, for

UD 015918

they had no soul; being beasts, they could be worked as beasts without violating Christian precepts. Baron de Montesquieu, writing in 1748, vindicated the right to make slaves of the "negroes" since "It is hardly to be believed that God, who is a wise Being, should place a soul, especially a good soul, in such a black ugly body."⁴ Furthermore, in a state of nature, Blacks were "wantonly" lazy; the God of Salvation is most pleased by diligent, industrious people. Consequently, those unwilling to comply with the cherished expectations of the Almighty could hardly anticipate approval from white Christians; if God could not very well admire the lazy Black, it would be too much to expect whites who, after all, were made in the very image of God, to admire what God Himself admonished. In short, white enchantment with economic expediency combined with racism to enslave black people; Christianity justified slavery as a legitimate form of oppression.

By the middle of the 19th century, slavery became incompatible with the economics of northern capitalists and, simultaneously, a drain upon the regional economy of the South. Yet, according to Eugene Genovese,⁵ slavery became a class symbol of southern aristocracy despite the expense; the removal of slavery would decimate the South's landed gentry. What was irreconcilable to a class interest in the South was, simultaneously, a class barrier to the industrialists of the North--and the Civil War could not be avoided.

With the destruction of the South by northern industrialists, Christianity, as the justification for white racism, collapsed along with slavery; it became imperative to nurture another rational in order to implant blacks into the emerging economy. With the destruction of slavery, blacks entered into an era of economic serfdom, becoming, for the most part, sharecroppers and tenants; they moved out of slavery and into a labor market based upon supply and demand. White racism itself prevailed, but in a different format; instead

of enslavement there would be segregation. The economic imperatives stemming from northern capitalists could not tolerate slavery, but were amenable to segregation. And with the re-alignment between economic aspirations and racism in the form of segregation there emerged the theory of social darwinism to sanctify the affinity. Blacks became endowed with certain "natural" qualities; they were made by nature to work in the agricultural economy of the New South, particularly owing to the humid and hot climate of the region. For whites to think of the black as anything but a person Nature intended for backbreaking field labor once more challenged not white inclinations to command but Nature's own designation; the survival of the fittest dogma conveniently served to justify degradation of black people. Evolutionary theory confirmed what was known all along, namely, the dominance of Nature over humans--and Nature would not permit white to exploit Black except in accord with natural principles that the best always wins.

When the economy shifted out of the intense laissez faire of rugged individualism and moved into corporate capitalism, it became increasingly difficult to justify white treatment of black through Christian theology and Darwinian doctrines. Religion just has no place in the empire-building of corporations; it played a fundamental part when capitalists constantly explained individual success to the Lord, but corporations don't bother. Nowhere is the disdain for Christian confirmation more obvious than in the Court ruling which declared corporations to be a body; thus, the corporation became a body without a soul--and with no soul there is no need for God. Furthermore, with an ever-expanding technology there is less dependence upon Nature; increasingly, production depends upon organizing people into the social organization of assembly-line and office work rather than planting the fields of nature. God became elusive and nature receded in the economics

or corporate capitalism; racism, however, persisted and still required justification so that, during the '50s and '60s, many voices cried out for Equal Treatment regardless of color; blacks would make great strides and move into mainstream America as whites abided by the Equality edicts resounding from the Halls of Justice. Just as we once insisted that God sanctified enslavement and Nature compelled white segregation of black, Equality emerged in response to the white need to validate racism.

Contrary to most observers, it is my contention that blacks have made no permanent or basic economic gain relative to whites over the past 25 years. The gap, for example, between white and black family incomes continues to grow: in 1949, the difference ~~in median income~~ was less than \$1,600; by 1964, it was more than \$3,000; in 1969, the difference stood at \$3,603; by 1972, the difference expanded to \$4,585. If Equality is to be the final arbiter for accomplishment, then it is clear that Blacks are losing out to whites. By 1969--15 years after the famous Equality decision by the Supreme Court of 1954--"over 87 per cent of all Negro public school students were enrolled in schools in which over 50 per cent of the student body was black, and almost 65 per cent were in schools that were 95 per cent (or more) black."⁷ During the 1960s, the suburbs went from 95% to 96% white, and the cities went black; housing ^s getting absolutely worst; the black infant mortality rate is rising substantially.⁸ Finally, the unemployment rate among Blacks stands not at the official 10% mark established by formal computations administered by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, but at least 20% to 25%.⁹

In short, by 1950 severe economic impairments set in for Blacks; therefore, the opportune moment to insist upon Equality arrived: economically debilitated, it became economically feasible to practice Equality because Blacks could not mix with whites. Lacking the economic resources, blacks could not purchase

homes in the suburb and would, therefore, be concentrated in the ghetto; forced to live in the ghetto because they are judged as any person would be--namely, on the ability to pay--Blacks reside in all-black neighborhoods so that "Any objective analysis of racial housing patterns in the United States leads," Frances Levenson and Margaret Fisher assert, "to the inescapable conclusion that residential segregation...is more widespread and more embedded as a national institution today than it was a century or a half century ago."¹⁰ Living with people of their own color, classrooms become racially separate due to the principle of neighborhood schools accepting enrollment from their districts regardless of color. Poorly equiped in the ghetto schools, educational opportunities grow slim and dropouts common so that the chance for employment in an economy based upon education no longer looms as a viable possibility even though the nation abounds with equal opportunity employers. "Having despised us," the great Black orator of the Civil War period, Frederick Douglass, emphatically declared, "it is not strange that Americans should seek to render us despicable; ...having denounced us as indolent, it is not strange that they should cripple our enterprise; having assumed our inferiority, it would be extraordinary if they sought to surround us with circumstances which would serve to make us direct contradictions of their assumption."¹¹ Equality, then, has been manipulated to enhance, rather than eliminate, racism.

It is no wonder, therefore, that Blacks eventually repudiated equality; the rejection came not only because the principle assured the separation of the races due to economic liabilities but also because the very equality standards themselves were set by whites. Hence, whites insisted that Blacks enter mainstream America on white terms even though the person is not to be judged by skin color but by ability, educational attainment, occupational

achievement, and so forth. Equality, predicated upon white expectations, makes the concept itself a racist formulation. Moreover, Blacks could hardly be expected to flow into mainstream America when one of the fundamental currents of the society is racism itself; to become fully Americanized, it would be necessary to be a racist since, as the Kerner Report so vividly announced, America is a racist society.

Consequently, Blacks set aside equality and demanded compensatory treatment; Blacks would be accepted because they are black. Programs selecting people because of color became more pronounced: head start schools; subsidies to expand the black presence upon America's most prestigious campuses; job-training programs; black capitalism; school busing; quotas for employment in white- and blue-collar occupations; and so forth. It is at this point in history that the I. Q. argument enters.⁹ And it emerges from educators because it has been, basically, in the area of education where Blacks have achieved a forceful presence without the customary "merit" qualifications.

The I. Q. argument is racist; more precisely, it is a racist ideology in exactly the same ways that Christianity, Darwinism, and Equality have been systems of justifications for America's racism. It fits the definition of racism: the formulation of criteria with an impact upon color so that a detrimental outcome is assured in spite of what the person who is being judged might do. A Black could not overcome Christian racism, for no matter what he might do he simply did not have a soul; a Black could not win over Nature, for no matter what he might do the Laws of Evolution made him an inferior creature in the struggle to survive with whites; a Black could not win according to the Equality principle because impoverished Blacks cannot afford to mix with an ever-prosperous white population; a Black cannot win under the I. Q. Argument for he is not endowed with innate genetic ability

called "intelligence."

- The genetic interpretation is racist in numerous other ways:

(1) The very subject matter selected for investigation is racist. The act of comparing intelligence between, among, and within animal species is not a biological phenomenon. Nowhere in nature do we find a biological basis requiring such comparison. Only humans, because of social learning--and not biology--, introduce the issue of intelligence. Only humans have the audacity to undertake invidious comparisons of intelligence within and across species, and there is not a shred of evidence showing a biological force in nature necessitating such contrasts; people alone, because of their social involvements, pursue such inquiries.

(2) Inquiry into intelligence itself is a matter of commitment to scholarly involvement. And the development of the I. Q. thesis has a long, and telling, history. The very originator of psychometrics, Sir Francis Galton, preserved a profound animosity toward the black Africans:

The number amongst Negroes of those who we should call half-witted, [Galton wrote in his book, Hereditary Genius (1869),] is very large. Every book alluding to Negro servants in America is full of instances. I myself was much impressed by this fact during my travels in Africa. The mistakes the Negroes made in their own matters were so childish, stupid and simpleton-like as frequently make me ashamed of my own species.¹²

Galton's racism continued when Blacks were excluded in composing the Stanford-Binet and Wechsler scales. Contemporary I. Q. advocates uphold the racist tradition by drawing and phrasing questions in harmony with white expectations and by relying upon biased surveys on intelligence testing by the U. S. military forces. ~~Thus~~ We find Egon Ernest Bergel, writing as late as 1962 in his work, Social Stratification, that

...the mentality of the middle and upper classes represents an advanced stage of maturity that the lower classes do not reach (or reach at a much later time)....In other words the lower classes remain more childlike or juvenile. This has to be taken as a statement of fact and no depreciatory meaning should be attached to it. However, a childlike or juvenile mind lacks the complexity and the sophistication without which higher cultural achievements are not possible.¹³

The proponents of the I. Q. perspective have been unable to rise above their racist heritage, for, in the words of William Graham Sumner,

It is vain to imagine that any man can lift himself out of those characteristic features of the group to which he belongs, especially when he is dealing with the nearest and most familiar phenomena of every day life. It is vain to imagine that a "scientific man" can divest himself of prejudice or previous opinion...He might as well try to get out of gravity or the pressure of the atmosphere.¹⁴

(3) A racist underpinning of the approach is found not only in the view but also within the responses to what is being purported as scientific research; not only is the clamor demanding this kind of study a perpetuation of a racist tradition, but the widespread support given to the perspective reveals how deep is the racism of whites. Response is as much a part of scientific concern as are the interests of scientists, and the endorsement for research pours forth because Blacks come out so poorly. One could readily conclude that if the results had demonstrated the distinct inferiority of whites to Blacks, the white outcry would drown any further contemplation for continuing the research. What a difference there would be if these same I. Q. investigators probed into war-making decisions in a country like America where only whites have been presidents to the sole exclusion of Blacks which, obviously, would lead to the conclusion that whites, more so than Blacks, are extremely violent prone so as to lead the entire nation into one war after another.

Racism underlies the support initiated by those concerned with "academic freedom"; when vigorous opposition came forth to challenge the

appearances of William Shockley on an eastern tour in the fall of 1973, when demands are issued to prevent the classroom use of books declared racist, such as Banfield's, The Unheavenly City, or when the Committee Against Racism promotes an anti-racist petition--immediately charges of violating basic academic freedoms are made. After all, doesn't anyone have the right to advocate sterilization of blacks and insist upon inherent inferiority? Or to assign any text book--even one which is conspicuously derogatory toward Blacks--even though Black students are enrolled in the course and are expected to accept the validity of such claims? The legions of academic freedom react in horror at the racism being advanced by the outspoken promoters of the I. Q. argument, but insist that basic rights must be preserved so as not to infringe upon the privileges of free speech; such intrinsic freedoms must not be abridged irrespective of what is being advocated. Thus, any person has the unassailable right to advance an erstwhile scholarly viewpoint even though, admittedly, there is a distinct deprecation of Black people. Consequently, we find defenders responding to the critics of the I. Q. argument demonstrating an utter disregard for what happens to Blacks in order that legalistic principles can be invoked; what might occur to Blacks as a result cannot interfere with what is taken to be a more fundamental principle--the right to certain freedoms.

What this reveals, at least to me, is that academic freedoms prevail at the expense of the Black minority; academicians exercise certain privileges by oppressing a Black minority simply by cloaking themselves in the transcendental rights of free expression to absolve themselves of any need for atonement toward the ultimate fate of Blacks in a racist society. It is clear that the actual experiences of people don't count; suffering people are "incidental" to any transcendental

entity whites invoke to buttress their peculiar enhancement over nonwhites. It was "unfortunate" a native Indian people had to be exterminated because white Christians, in settling the New World, believed in a religious freedom requiring obedience to the Will of God; it was a "natural" fate for the poor to be left "unfit" according to the Law of Nature since advocates of Social Darwinism insisted freedom meant the liberty of human society to evolve according to the mandates of Nature; and it is "incidental" to exterminate millions in Southeast Asia to implant the American reign inasmuch as any nation has the freedom to do whatever America's national interests dictate when, in the words of the Secretary of State under President Truman, Dean G. Acheson, "We are willing to help people who believe the way we do, to continue to live the way they want to live."¹⁵ As Blacks confront an academic formulation of genetic genocide, they immediately confront powerful defenders of academic freedom who are prepared to sacrifice Blacks upon the altar of the inviolable demands for Free Speech.

Yet, this academic response is intrinsically racist precisely because it fails to take into account the highly detrimental consequences besetting blacks. It is also racist because it imposes upon all, Black and white alike, an erstwhile principle about which Blacks have had no significant input. As with standards for equality, standards for freedom are white concepts; not only have blacks been deliberately excluded in the formulation of basic freedoms well before the American Revolution, but there is, even today, absolutely no contemplation even for the opportunity to do so. Instead, Blacks are expected to comply to all notions of academic freedom in spite of the fact that no Black person was around on American campuses at the time of formulation.

The demand is being made upon those opposed to academic racism passing in the guise of academic freedom to tolerate a patently racist perspective. But we must not be so open minded that our brains begin out. to fall/ Note, too, how the voices for academic freedom are extremely intolerant; none, to the best of my knowledge, has ever entertained the thought that there may well be a compelling need to revise traditional freedoms in light of the Black experience--and that there may be a compelling need to incorporate Blacks in any such effort to reformulate a more equitable sense of justice toward all people. Freedom is not an abstraction but is, instead, immersed in all kinds of restraints and, indeed, contradictions.. Freedoms do not constitute license, hence we have libel and slander suits, and court rulings declaring that no one has the right to free speech to the point of shouting "Fire!" in a crowded theater. Yet, rather than coming forth with any suggestion to reconsider traditional academic freedoms, the opponents of the I. Q. argument are accused of challenging inviolable academic concepts of righteousness.

(4) Finally, the I. Q. argument, like its predecessors, is racist because the Black is held accountable for failure; as William Ryan¹⁶ has so perceptively observed, the Black victim is being blamed for his own defeat at white hands. The Black person had no soul; the Black person was inferior in the struggle for survival; the Black person lacked the economic resources to compete on equal terms with whites; and the I. Q. contention leads, according to John Daniels and Vincent Houghton, "inevitably to assert that the blame belongs on the shoulders of the victim."¹⁷ "It has always been a popular technique among bigots," Leonard J. Fein writes, "to blame the alleged failings of the groups they attack on the groups themselves rather than on their own hostility."¹⁸

I. Q. theories and their instant popularity arrive at a strategic moment in time--when fantastically new technology makes labor and mind so dispensable that reliance upon people is no longer essential. As people become expendable then the question is raised: What is to be done with people who are not needed? The technological transformation and its significance for Black people is readily acknowledged by one of the foremost proponents, Richard Herrnstein (a Harvard psychologist):

Technological unemployment is not just a matter of "dislocation" or "retraining" if the jobs created are beyond the native capacity of the newly unemployed....And the ones who stay out of work are most likely the ones with the low I. Q.'s [i.e., Black people]...in times to come, as technology advances, the tendency to be unemployed may run in the genes of a family about as certainly as bad teeth do now.¹⁹

This is a clear indictment of Black people--and it is justified because blacks are inherently less capable than whites. "Black Americans," Professor Samuel Yette of Howard University writes in his recent book, The Choice: The Issue of Black Survival in America,

have outlived their usefulness...Once an economic asset, they are now considered an economic drag. The wood is all hewn, the water all drawn, the cotton all picked, and the rails reach from coast to coast. The ditches are all dug, the dishes are put away, and only a few shoes remain to be shined.

Thanks to old black backs and newfangled machines, the sweat chores of the nation are done. Now the some 25 million Blacks face a society that is brutally pragmatic, technologically accomplished, deeply racist, increasingly overcrowded, and surly. In such a society, the absence of social and economic value is a crucial factor in anyone's fight for a future.²⁰

The advocates of I. Q. inferiority offer a perfect rationale for whites to dismiss the technologically disposable Blacks: lacking in sufficient intelligence, there will be no place for Blacks in the increasingly sophisticated economy of machine production. The issue, as Yette so cogently declares, is indeed a matter of sheer survival. But whites suffer no pangs of guilt, for to discard Blacks amounts to nothing at all inasmuch as one can be nothing unless one is inherently intelligent, just as surely as during the era of

slavery one could not be a slave unless he were a beastly brute.

The outpouring of interest in the connection between biology and intelligence cannot be divorced from the serious prospects of genocide. Jensen has confessed that what he advocates today his counterparts in Nazi Germany accomplished shortly before six million Jews marched into the gas chambers.²¹ Already, it is not only that research is being conducted to uncover supposed biological knowledge under the rubric of genetic studies, but also to effect implementation of a final solution toward Blacks. Having found ethnic genetic differences, scientists now envision ethnic weapons to cope with the distinctions. For instance, Carl Larson, a Swedish geneticist, elaborates in the Army journal, Military Review, a scheme of chemical biological warfare applying ethnic-specific poisons upon a human population.²²

Having perfected an ethnic-specific weapon of destruction and having declared the distinct inferiority of black to white in terms of intelligence, and given the racist heritage of White America, where are the reasons to contemplate restrictions upon the use of such weapons with which to destroy Black people without, simultaneously, eradicating whites? Is it beyond the pale of imagination for scientists to invent such tools and then, as a Dr. Strangelove or the general in Seven Days in May, release biological agents with the self-righteous declaration of preserving human intelligence from the onslaught of black inferiority on the basis of neo-Darwinian principles? Can we trust the reserve of one white president after another--after what has been done to the American Indian and what is now being done to the Vietnamese^A to hold back upon Blacks in America? In light of Attica? In light of George Jackson, homicides in Memphis, police squads in Detroit, assassination of Martin Luther King? Is this a nation prepared to preserve the integrity of a Black people now being placed on the dumb side of white intelligence and forced to live a debilitating life upon increasingly impoverished ghetto-reservations?

Footnotes

1. While white scholars, for the most part, euphorically expound notions of meaningful soci-economic progress for Blacks during the 'sixties and into the 'seventies and, simultaneously, so studiously ignore the very serious possibilities for whites to invoke genocide against Blacks, Black people seriously contemplate the serious prospects of liquidation. See, Castellano Turner and William Darity, "Fears of genocide among Black Americans as related to age, sex, and region," American Journal of Public Health, December, 1973, Vol. 63, 1029-1034. Even population control programs receive very thoughtful consideration by Blacks as a possible technique by which whites eliminate Blacks; see Ronald Walters, "Population control and the black community," THE BLACK SCHOLAR, Vol. 5, May, 1974, pp. 45-51.
2. Lewis M. Killian, "Optimism and pessimism in sociological analysis," THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGIST, Vol. 6, November, 1971, p. 284.
3. See my, "Equality: America's racist ideology," in RADICAL SOCIOLOGY, David J. Colfax and Jack L. Roach, eds., New York: Basic Books, 1971, pp. 246-262; and my, WHO NEEDS THE NEGRO?, Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1971.
4. Baron de Montesquieu, THE SPIRIT OF LAWS, Vol. 1, New York: The Colonial Press, 1900.
5. Eugene Genovese, THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF SLAVERY, New York: Vintage, 1967.
6. See my, "Equality: America's racist ideology," op. cit.
7. Leonard J. Fein, THE ECOLOGY OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS, New York: Pegasus, 1971, p. 5.
8. It is worth noting that it is quite common for demographers to treat infant mortality as a reasonably reliable indicator of living standards among people of the Third World; hence, it is reasonable to infer a worsening of the Black people in America.
9. For a very cogent analysis of how unemployment is manipulated to attain a lower figure, see Harry Brill, "Unemployment: official and real," THE NATION, Vol. 212, January 25, 1971, p. 100; and John C. Leggett and Claudette Cervinka, "Countdown: how to lie with statistics," in SOCIAL PROBLEMS IN AMERICAN SOCIETY, Boston, Massachusetts: Holbrook Press, 1973, pp. 234-257.
10. Frances Levenson and Margaret Fisher, "The struggle for open housing," in FREEDOM NOW!, Alan F. Westin, ed., New York: Basic Books, 1964, pp. 184-185.
11. Frederick Douglass, THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF FREDERICK DOUGLASS, Philip S. Foner, ed., New York: International Publishers, 1955, Vol. II, p. 268.
12. Francis Galton, HEREDITARY GENIUS, p. 395 as quoted by John Daniels and Vincent Houghton, "Jensen, Eysenck and the eclipse of the Galton paradigm," in RACE AND INTELLIGENCE, Ch. 4, p. 77, Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, 1972.

13. Egon Ernest Bergel, *SOCIAL STRATIFICATION*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962, p. 419.

14. William Graham Sumner, *FOLKWAYS* as quoted by Morris E. Opler, "The human being in culture theory," in *READINGS IN ANTHROPOLOGY*, Morton H. Fried, ed., New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1968, 2n ed., Vol. II, p. 23.

15. Quoted by William Appleton Williams, *THE TRAGEDY OF AMERICAN DIPLOMACY*, New York: Delta Book, rev. & enl. ed., 1961, p. 10; emphasis supplied.

16. William Ryan, *BLAMING THE VICTIM*, New York: Vintage, 1971. See also, Charles Valentine, *CULTURE AND POVERTY*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968; and Charles A. Valentine, "Deficit, difference, and bicultural models," *HARVARD EDUCATIONAL REVIEW*, Vol. 42, May, 1971, pp. 137-157.

17. Daniels and Houghton, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

18. Fein *op. cit.*, p. 40.

19. Richard Herrnstein, "I. Q.," *ATLANTIC*, Vol. 228, September, 1971, p. 63.

20. Samuel Yette, *THE CHOICE: THE ISSUE OF BLACK SURVIVAL IN AMERICA..*

21. *Ibid.*, pp. 251-252.

22. See, F. L., "Ethnic weapons," *RAMPARTS*, Vol. 10, November, 1971, p. 4.